DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 692 HE 022 797

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE Beyond the Ivory Tower: College and University Partnerships with Business.
PUB DATE 3 Jun 89
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at a Conference sponsored by Universita Degli Studi Di Roma and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Rome, Italy, June 2-3, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; Public Service; *School Business Relationship; Social Influences; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

Concern about the role of university faculty in society is universal in both place and time. Just as the degree of emphasis in a university's mission and a faculty's activity can vary by place and time, so also can the resulting role of individual faculty members vary. Changes in these activities are discussed, noting that these changes concern the role of individual faculty members in relation to society at large, the role of the institution as an institution in relation to other social institutions and organizations, and the role of individual faculty members in support of the institutional mission to serve society. Topics of discussion are as follows: the role of faculty in fulfilling the institutional mission for service; patron, client, and partner in the context of corporate-college relations; metaphors for collegiate contributions to corporate development; and reasons for caution. It is important to consider the dynamic tensions that develop on campus in response to society's needs for educational services. Such concerns lead to questions about the role of faculty in support of institutional mission as well as the role of the university in contemporary society. Attached is a 1985 paper entitled "Comments on the Evolution and Integration of Coordinating Board Functions: Invited Critique of Current Research, Association for the Study of Higher Education Panel on Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Chicago." (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310692

Beyond the Ivory Tower: College and University Partnerships with Business

by
Robert A. Scott
President
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Background

Concern about the role of university faculty in society is universal in both place and time. Variations are in degree and balance. The essential elements are constant, and concern the relative emphasis of a campus mission and faculty activity on intellectual vs. ethical approaches; narrow specialization vs. a liberal arts approach; basic vs. applied research; scholarship vs. teaching, and each of these vs. public service; and the tensions that exist between the ideal of learning for its own sake and society's emphasis on credentials and the solution of immediate problems. These missions and activities are in dynamic tension to different degrees at different times on different college campuses.

Just as the degree of emphasis in a university's mission and a faculty's activity can vary by place and time, so also can the resulting role of individual faculty members vary. In fact, it is changes in these activities which are the topic of this discussion. These changes concern the role of individual faculty members in relation to society at large; the role of the institution as an institution in relation to other social institutions and organizations; and the role of individual faculty members in support of the institutional mission to serve society (in addition to serving society as an individual or consultant).

Invited presentation at a conference sponsored by Universita Degli Studi Di Roma and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities: "The Role of University Professor in the Contemporary Society," Rome, June 2-3, 1989. Publicized as "Economic Production and Development/Corporate Relations."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert A. Scott
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AE 022 197

The Role of Faculty in Fulfilling the Institutional Mission for Service

The focus of these comments will be on the role of faculty in fulfilling the institutional mission for service. This is the area of greatest change in recent years as the state and private sector have increased their expectations for how institutions will serve society, and institutional leaders have turned to faculty to fulfill these expectations.

The roles and expectations of individual faculty and academic units to meet public needs are historic, not new. The experiences of our schools of agriculture and their extension services, schools of medicine and their clinical practices, and schools of education and their lab schools are instructive. But these were not institutional obligations per se. They were departmental and school programs. And university faculty throughout the industrial world have the equivalent of at least one day per week for consulting and commercial activity.

Today state governments and private industry express their expectations for universities to serve the ends of economic development and international trade. As a result, the relationships between institutions of higher education and industry are developing in new ways, and expanding from that of patron to that of client and partner.

Patron, Client, Partner: Corporate-College Relations

For years, higher education has looked to business as a patron. Thorstein Veblen and John Jay Chapman attained a degree of their fame by deriding these relationships.[1]

---

[1]The Emergence of the American University, Laurence R. Veysey, The University of Chicago Press, 1965, p. 346.

In the past decade, corporate America has increased its role as patron relative to other sources of revenue. During this period, corporate support of higher education increased by 235% compared to 65% by the federal government, 15% by state government, and 132% by voluntary contributions.[2]

One of the ways in which the relationships between business and higher education has changed is suggested by the term "client." Institutions enter into contracts to provide services such as research and training to client corporations and industry associations. Such arrangements include not only biotechnology and computing but also management development and language training.

The third relationship, in addition to patron and client, is that of "partner." Even a four-year college the size of Ramapo can enter into such arrangements, as I will describe.

These three roles have existed for some time, of course, but the number and complexity of examples have increased in response to new demands and new expectations from major sources of institutional funding.

Metaphors for Collegiate Contributions to Corporate Development

Relations between colleges and corporations can be further delineated into four categories which give greater definition to the roles of client and partner. These categories are drawn

---

[2]Strategic Responses to Demographic Changes: Students, Faculty, and Patrons, Robert A. Scott, Ramapo College of New Jersey - American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1988, p. 14.

from the fields of business, and include joint venture, licensing, overseas development, and "trade."[3]

As an example of "joint ventures," I cite the Ramapo College arrangement with Lederle Laboratories (the Medical Research Division of American Cyanamid), which includes eleven Ph.D. scientists from Lederle doing basic research in neurosciences under corporate and government contracts with Ramapo faculty on our campus. This arrangement provides opportunities for Ramapo students to serve as lab assistants and coop interns, and to begin to qualify for the joint Ramapo-Rutgers BS-Graduate articulation agreement in biology and chemistry. Another example is the joint development by Ramapo, Rutgers, the Port Authority and the New Jersey Division of International Trade of the N.J. Center for International Business Education.

As an example of licensing, I offer our arrangement with Bio-Metallics, to which we have "sold" faculty time for research and for which we also receive an annual cash stipend and a percentage of revenues from the procedures developed by the faculty member. Another form of "licensing" is our plan to offer the Rutgers University MBA on our campus as a high quality, well-known programmatic convenience to area executives in international business.

For overseas development, I cite our work with the state banks of Indonesia, where we have advised executive development programs on English language training and preparation for graduate management education in the U.S. Another example is our work with a new state-sponsored consulting firm in Shanghai to expand cultural and trade relations with Israel.

---

[3]Robert A. Scott, "A Corporate-Campus Symbiosis," The New York Times, December 15, 1985, New Jersey section, p. 40.

As an example of "trade," I will describe my philosophy of fundraising, which I call an "exchange of values"--an exchange of valued services which results in added benefits to each side. The "values," or valued institutional services, to be exchanged for annual or one-time corporate donations of cash, equipment and in-kind contributions (such as executives on loan, landscaping, and even the simple use of a construction crane) may be described as "intellectual," "cultural," and "physical."

Intellectual services to be offered include regular courses or custom-designed seminars offered on campus or at a corporate site; advising; consulting; conferences on special topics; research; library or data-base access, etc. Particular projects include programs on Japanese language and culture for the American employees of Japanese firms; seminars on American business history and practice for Japanese executives, and conferences for American firms on the European Economic Community in 1992 and beyond, and on marketing in the Pacific Rim.

Cultural services include group rates to plays, concerts, and exhibits; special corporate "family" nights at events, and even special events for corporate clients. Physical facilities may be offered for use by corporations for recreation, sales meetings, and holiday parties. Some institutions even develop research or science parks near a campus where both start-up and mature companies can gain easy access to university researchers and results.

In each case, a major criterion for consideration when deciding on such an arrangement is compatibility with institutional mission and individual academic freedom for teaching and research.

These institutional services are offered in response to changes in the social and economic environment for higher education, as well as for reasons of mission. In addition, states are more active in setting priorities for higher education initiatives through increased programs of competitive grant funding as opposed to full funding of basic necessities of salaries, equipment, and facilities. States call upon colleges and universities to provide research and training to the private sector as part of state efforts to support economic development.

Given these changes in the financial support of higher education, college and university presidents have had to think of "markets" as well as mission in fulfilling their responsibilities as academic leaders and financial managers, and in setting priorities for collective institutional efforts. "Strategic" is now a common term on campuses.

Those forces, as well as the increased magnitude of the needs on campus, and the increased involvement on campus of corporate executives, have resulted in these new forms of arrangement and service.

Reasons for Caution

There are, however, reasons for caution. Most of us think of higher education in terms of teaching, research, and service based on mission. We now see the need to consider market as well as mission in setting priorities. I believe we need to consider these roles of the university in a new way in order to understand the tensions related to the mission-market balance.

First, each institution has a mission as a campus, i.e., as a center for teaching and scholarship apart from society, but contributing to it. The campus both preserves traditions and creates new

knowledge. It is related to people and their artifacts as well as to their futures. As a campus, an institution preserves, creates, and prepares.

Second, collegiate institutions are also colleges, social organizations among other social organizations, a part of society that must be understood in terms of the great themes of social science - community, authority, status, the sacred, and alienation.

Colleges are unique institutions in this way. They are apart from and a part of society. They are at the periphery, the cutting edge in terms of science and technology, analysis and interpretation, as well as the creation of new knowledge and challenge to the status quo.

Yet they are also at the center of things, playing an instrumental role in helping society evolve from one era to another. Through the interpretation and reinterpretation of what we know, they become a source of wisdom.

Institutions need to be at the center of things, and to preserve the past and prepare their students for the future. But they also need the experience of being at the edge and the freedom to express a new vision of the future.[4]

The new demands on institutions of higher education can distort this balance. The balance must be preserved in order to protect the integrity of institutions.

---

[4]This section excerpted from "The President as Sociologist as President," by Robert A. Scott, Eastern Sociological Association, Baltimore, Maryland, March 17, 1989.

There are other reasons for concern as well. Institutional incentives and rewards to encourage faculty efforts in support of the institutional mission for service must be developed and refined. How should these new activities in support of institutional missions be incorporated with those already considered when making decisions about salary, tenure and rank? How should these forms of service be considered when recruiting new faculty?

And finally, we need criteria for saying "No" to proposed arrangements that are not congruent with institutional mission and priorities. After all, we need our faculty to teach and advise students; running a company is not part of our mission. We need criteria that are clear about our institutional role in providing value-added services as opposed to on-going operations or management to a private sector patron. At Ramapo, we have rejected two proposed joint ventures which would have required the college to distort our priorities, permit proprietary research on campus, and dedicate excessive amounts of faculty time.

Conclusion

Society's needs for educational services and applied research are great, and through credit and non-credit instruction, consulting, and sponsored research, college and university faculties are aiding in economic development and state strategy for international trade. Yet at the same time, one must be concerned about the dynamic tensions that develop on campus in response to these needs: students as both late adolescents and apprentices; faculty members as professionals balancing the demands of teaching, scholarship, and professional practice; and corporate patrons as essential to campus progress but still external to it and a cause of concern about academic freedom. Such concerns lead to questions about the role of faculty in support of institutional mission as well as about the role of university faculty in contemporary society.

Comments on the Evolution and Integration
of Coordinating Board Functions: Invited Critique
of Current Research, Association for the Study of Higher Education
Panel on Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Chicago

March 16, 1985

Robert A. Scott
Indiana Commission for Higher Education

As one who entered state-level work in 1979 because I thought it was where the agenda for higher education would be defined and debated, and now leaves it for a public college campus, I reflected on the papers by J. Frederick Volkwein ("State Control of Public Universities and its Relationship to Academic Quality: Results of a National Study") and Nancy Jo Westphal ("Toward the Study of Functional Linkages in Statewide Agencies for Higher Education") with special interest. Both present insights into important issues of statewide control and coordination.

When reading the papers, I considered such features as the thesis, literature review, sample, analysis, and conclusions used and presented. I decided that my special contribution, given the time allowed, would be to comment on the broader context of statewide control and coordination and to reflect on the authors' conclusions from my perspective, rather than to dwell on technical issues.

Volkwein concludes that in his sample of public doctoral-granting research universities he found "little evidence to support the claim that freedom from external academic and financial control is associated with faculty and student quality." Rather, he found, "that the significant differences in quality among institutions are explained by differences in state generosity

and campus size." So, if a public doctoral-granting research university wants to have high quality faculty and students, it should be large and in a generous state!

Westphal concludes first that consolidated governing boards exhibit greater potential than coordinating boards for effectively linking the responsibilities of budget review, program review, and planning. Second, she concludes that both types of boards exhibit weak potential for effectively linking their authority for the review of existing programs with the responsibilities of new program review, budget review, and planning. All of this leaves me with the conclusion—if both authors are correct—that existing program review mandated by a statewide board has little impact on quality at public, doctoral-granting research universities. For the sake of the past six years of my life, I hope this is not true.

Both papers are concerned with the effects of statewide coordination and raise good questions. Both are concerned with the cumulative or integrated effects of statewide board functions and question their effectiveness. While I cannot speak for every board, or even for one class of board, I can comment from the perspective of one board. We might then have some hint of the complexities of such boards which are not addressed in these papers.

Like many other coordinating boards, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education was created in the early 1970's (1971) with three principal functions. First, it was given authority for planning in order to assist

the state in managing the growth of the higher education enterprise, to define missions and enrollment levels, and to maintain a plan which would ensure access to higher education for the citizens of Indiana. Second, it was given authority to recommend budget levels and the distribution of funding. Third, it was given authority to approve new degree programs, campuses, institutes, centers, and other organized academic activities in large part to manage growth and to limit unwarranted duplication. The authority to review existing programs was added later, as it was in many other states when subsequent legislation either added or clarified authority for reviewing programs.

Over the past fourteen years these three principal functions have been performed in different ways according to the needs of the time. The period of the late 1960's and early 1970's was a period of expansion and growth of regional campuses as the state developed and increased the number of structures and programs to provide access. The late 1970's and early 1980's comprised another period of expansion, especially in vocational, technical, and technological education. The early to mid-1980's have seen special emphasis given to the conservation of scarce resources, economic development initiatives, and increased access through extension efforts.

In my own agency, I have learned through reading early documents and talking with senior commission members that there has been a serial development of functions, with each stage of development building on the last and not clearly separated from either earlier or subsequent stages. Each stage of Commission development represents strong tendencies and

contains within it the continuing tension between a commission which reacts to institutional initiatives and one which initiates and takes "pro-active" stands. These stages of development were in response to the needs of the time.

The period from 1971 to 1973 might be called the period of the plan, a period of growth and differentiation in and among campuses and in the development of the concept of a statewide system embracing both independent and public higher education. During this period the broad outlines for the future development of higher education were identified. The period from 1974 to 1978 could be thought of as the period of developing technical competence and the establishment of numerous data bases which provide the foundation for planning and decision making. Data bases for costs, students, enrollments, facilities, equipment, and programs were conceived and over time were developed in order to give the state the capacity to comprehend the full system in ways which had not been available to either institutions or agencies.

The third period, which extended roughly from 1978 to the present time, included further development of data bases and computing capabilities, and might be considered the period of system building. This was the time during which commission staff and members gave special attention to raising the sights of institutions and communities to see a higher education world in which cooperation, new ventures, and technologies to provide access became reality. New incentives were created or discussed for developing cooperative ventures for increasing service. Initiatives which would

become reality only later were started during this period, including the program start-up fund, a fund of money to be released by the state budget committee to start new initiatives between biennial budget sessions upon the recommendation of the Commission for Higher Education and the State Board of Vocational - Technical Education.

Finally, starting perhaps in late 1983 and developing in 1984 and 1985 is the time which I call the period of accountability. Trends will be monitored closely, performance will be related to a set of objectives, uneconomic and inefficient programs will be reviewed rigorously, mission definitions will be constrained, and connections between state coordinating board functions, especially program review and reallocation, will be strengthened.

In each of these stages some functions received more emphasis than others; an observer, therefore, could have the impression that board functions are neither integrated nor balanced equally. However, I would argue that particular functions and authority are emphasized according to the needs of the time. In fact, not all forms of authority have been exercised, in large part because they have not yet been felt to be needed.

The needs of each period affect the issues raised. Thus, they also affect staffing patterns and the manner in which issues are addressed. At each stage, the Indiana Commission as an institution has had more experience and greater competence to choose its course of action and the functions to be emphasized.

If the landscape I have sketched makes any sense, what might we expect to see over the next hill? I think we will see a period of even greater state initiative. The signs are already evident, including the rapid decline of federal involvement. By state initiative, I do not mean the role which helps institutions look to the horizon and see that the sum can be greater than the total of the parts by cooperative efforts and imaginative ventures; I mean a period when the state will take a more active role in expressing its own desired directions for higher education, when funding proposals are initiated by the state for particular activities, particular programs, and particular efforts. During this period I would expect to see even greater exercise of the Commission's program review, mission, and enrollment authorities as part of planning and budget development.

At each step or stage, boards have choices. They can choose to give greater emphasis to bureaucratic concerns, to market considerations, to being reactive, or to taking initiative. The tension between a long-term and the short-term view is always present, and choices must be made. Research such as that presented today helps boards raise questions and consider their principles and actions in carrying out the related functions of planning, program review, and making budget recommendations.